

SENATOR LINDSAY: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And you believe that that is not a violation of the separation of powers?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Actually it's irrelevant whether I believe it is a violation or not. The question is whether there will be five people on the Supreme Court that think it is.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, but I want us to make some legislative history because it is very important what you think since you're the one who authored this amendment, so your thinking is important.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Do I think it's...no, I do not think it's a violation. I think you can have...there are certain things we can do. Some of the things you talked about earlier that...about what we can have them put in the opinions, what we can have them...whether we can have them sign opinions, some of those type of things where it's been argued both ways. And there is a...I mean, there's a line in there somewhere about what we can and can't do.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. My time is running and there's a couple of things that I want to say, and my light's on again so I can continue this. But here's what everybody's counting on, that the Supreme Court is going to be made up of seven people from whom five cannot be found to uphold the integrity of the Supreme Court. What is at stake here now is not the precedential value of appellate court opinions, but whether the Legislature is going to be able to dictate to the Supreme Court as to what its authority and scope of power actually are. Now if the Supreme Court...

PRESIDENT ROBAK PRESIDING

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...is looking at itself as a separate branch of government, I believe it's going to be jealous of its prerogatives, and I don't believe that a bill such as this with the amendment that is before us, if it's attached, will be upheld as constitutional by the Supreme Court. I don't believe it. And if the Supreme Court rules that a matter has been